



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

P. Cornelius Tacitus, *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, erklärt von Dr. CONSTANTIN JOHN. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1899.

In this edition Dr. John, rector of the Gymnasium in Schwäbisch-Hall (Württemberg), presents the mature results of long study devoted to the *Dialogus*, of which numerous specimens have been already published and for the most part received with cordial approval. The results of the long controversial discussion concerning authorship, dramatic date, date of publication, structure of the dialogue, lacunae, sources, etc., are summarized skillfully and in general with sober independence of judgment in the moderate compass of 61 pages. In the treatment of the text, with one or two conspicuous exceptions, the editor is conservative and sane; the explanatory and illustrative annotation is adequate and intelligent. The work has been received very cordially and is likely to be looked upon as an authoritative repertory of the status of *Dialogus* studies at the end of the century.

Dr. John has made free use of the labors of his predecessors, to most of whom, in the nature of the case, only general acknowledgment could be made. His indebtedness to Professor Gudeman is more specific, and it should be a gratification to American philological pride to observe that in many places, especially of the introduction, Professor Gudeman's results have been accepted or have influenced the author's presentation.

It is doubtless on the whole fortunate that in many of the problems which the *Dialogus* presents, there is manifest a tendency toward crystallization of opinion. So, for example, with the exception of Mr. Steele<sup>1</sup> (*A. J. P.* XVII 289), no one is now found to doubt the Tacitean authorship, and Mr. Steele seems not to have recognized that his argument against the authenticity proves all that an argument from style is capable of proving for it, viz. that the language does not prevent us from assigning the work to Tacitus. No one could fairly claim more. We are bound to believe our record until belief is shown to be impossible; but if the MSS. in attributing works to ancient authors, only furnish us with a thesis to prove, there is opened a vista of scepticism and material for dissertations at which the mind boggles. In some other cases there is evidence of a certain agreement or tendency

<sup>1</sup>To whom, I see, must be added Valmaggi and Novák. Cf. *Woch. f. kl. Phil.*, No. 51, 1899

toward agreement in conclusions which seem to me very uncertain or demonstrably false. Three such examples I shall select for more detailed discussion.

The first is a question of the interpretation of 17, 13, on which passage alone John very justly bases his conclusion concerning the time when the dialogue is thought of as taking place. It is the ill-famed enumeration of 120 years from the death of Cicero. The last step is as follows: (*adice*) *sextam iam felicitis huius rem publicam fovet: centum et viginti anni ab interitu Ciceronis in hunc diem colliguntur*. This is interpreted in the usual way as the sixth year of Vespasian's reign, and the middle of the year 74 is thus obtained as the dramatic date. But even a dead text will cry out against the accumulation of improbabilities which cluster about this conclusion. For (1) *stationem* must stand in a meaning otherwise unparalleled. (2) We should expect *sex stationes* to obtain the meaning sought. (3) The total is not 120, but only 116-117. (4) *Qua* is changed to *quo*.

But that my criticism may not be negative only, I would call attention to the fact that there is a more methodical, even if not a perfectly satisfactory, interpretation of the passage, to which Petersen alludes briefly in his note and which I believe is attributed to Steiner, whose work, unfortunately, is not accessible to me. I shall present it therefore *meo Marte*, starting from the clue which the word *statio* affords. As interpreted above, the meaning assigned to *statio* is unparalleled; it becomes practically impossible, when we realize that the word from the time of Augustus had taken on a specific metaphorical meaning, as a designation of the relation of the *princeps* to the state. His position is conceived of as that of a sentry or watch shielding the state (*stationem, qua Vespasianus rem publicam fovet*). Augustus was perhaps the first to suggest this relationship, and Gellius (XV 7) has preserved a letter of his *ad Gaium nepotem* concluding with a prayer for the safety of both, *in statu reipublicae felicissimo ἀνδραγαθούτων ὑμῶν καὶ διαδεχομένων stationem meam*. The word is used in the same way of the imperial relation to the state in Ovid (*Tristia*, II 219 *princeps statione relicta*), in Velleius, in Lucan, in Suetonius, in Pliny (Panegyricus), by Antoninus Pius of himself, and later (v. Boetticher, *Lex. Tac.*, and Forcellini, s. v.). The metaphor thus passed at an early time into an elevated designation or description of the reign of the ruling emperor. Of this meaning every Roman reader must have thought in the present passage, while the addition of *qua rem publicam fovet*, defining accurately the relation, left him no choice but to entertain it. But the addition of *sextam* to *stationem* has introduced confusion, and it must be confessed that an idiomatic Latin usage has here exposed the interpretation of these words to ambiguity. In the preceding enumeration from the death of Cicero the steps are: I, Augustus; II, Tiberius; III, Gaius; IV, Claudius and Nero; V, Galba Otho

Vitellius; and finally (*iam*) VI (*sextam iam* etc.), Vespasian. Now, it is a well-recognized fact that Latin often makes use of an adjective modifier where modern tongues would employ an adverb or some other form. E. g. Cic. Tusc. V 93, where a third group of the Epicurean division of pleasures is introduced thus: *tertias (cupiditates) . . . funditus eiciendas putavit*; or again, Quintil. X I, 95 *non sola carminum varietate* instead of *non solum*. And so here. On *iam* marking the last member of an enumeration v. Seyffert, Schol. Lat.<sup>4</sup> I, p. 36, who cites Cic. de Nat. Deor. II 132, and Brutus 159; cf. also Tac. An. II 21. Against this interpretation may be urged the fact that it leaves the reader to reckon out the exact year of Vespasian which is meant, to make up the total of 120, and that I confess we should scarcely expect, unless it were, perhaps, the writer's purpose to make the indication of dramatic date not specific, but to leave it implicit. At all events, it would be a touch not alien to the manner of dialogue as a dramatic form (cf. Hirzel, Der Dialog, vol. II, p. 49). If this interpretation be correct, we should place the scene of the dialogue, not with John in the middle of 74, but toward the end of 77, 120 years from the death of Cicero.

In regard to the rôle of Secundus in the first debate between Aper and Maternus on the merits of poetry and oratory, John, with Gudeman and others, says that Secundus refuses to act as judge, and that therefore a negative which the MSS do not give must be inserted, thus: *et ego enim, quatenus arbitrum litis huius inveniri <non licuit>, non patiar Maternum societate plurium defendi*. But quite without reason, or rather with singular misapprehension of the whole tone of the preceding words. Maternus rejoices that they have found a judge who shall decide between them. Secundus rejoins that he must be excused as prejudiced on account of his well-known friendship with the poet Saleius Bassus. Aper replies, dismissing the suggestion of prejudice which Secundus had urged, by pointing out that the case of Saleius or any one else, who was a poet and nothing else, had nothing in common with that of Maternus. He therefore claims Secundus as arbiter.

Finally, a word concerning the lacuna which John (following Andresen and Gudeman) assumes in 40, 7, after *admovebant*. I have discussed this before in reviewing Professor Gudeman's edition (A. J. P., vol. XVI, p. 84), and I would only add here that even if one could grant that the general character of the matter between ch. 36 and ch. 42 seemed to indicate more than one speaker, it would still be necessary to say that the lacuna must be sought somewhere else than here. For on the one side of the assumed gap we have as a reason for the development of eloquence *datum ius potentissimum quemque vexandi*—an obvious transference to Roman conditions and to oratory of the *ἄδεια τοῦ σκόπτειν* of Attic *παρηγορία*, as is further indicated by *ut histriones* below. On the other side such eloquence is called *alumna*

*licentiae quam stulti libertatem vocabant*, which did not arise in well-ordered states,—not in Sparta nor in Crete, Macedonia nor Persia, but in Athens. If a lacuna must be found, obviously it can not be sought here.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

---

#### SUNDRY RECENT WORKS IN ENGLISH PHILOLOGY.

Among recent works issued from the Clarendon Press is a new edition of *King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius De Consolatione Philosophiae* (Oxford, 1899), edited from the MSS, with introduction, critical notes, and glossary, by WALTER JOHN SEDGEFIELD, M. A. Melb., B. A. Cantab., late scholar of Trinity College, Melbourne.

The text is based on the Cotton MS (C), with variants from the Bodleian MS (B); and omissions in C, due to injury in the great fire of 1731, are supplied from B. A short fragment, fifty lines, from another MS (N), discovered in 1886 by Prof. Napier in the Bodleian (MS Bodl. 86), is appended. Of these MSS, C is the oldest, and dates from the time of King Alfred, or shortly afterwards. B is independent of C, and dates from the early twelfth century. The fragment N is assigned to the first half of the tenth century. Junius made a transcript of B, with some variants from C, which is also preserved in the Bodleian Library.

This edition contains the prose version of the Latin prose original, common to B and C, the prose version of the Latin *carmina*, found only in B, and the metrical version of the Latin *carmina*, found only in C. The Latin originals are not given. The introduction gives a bibliography and a condensed analysis of the relation of the Old English to the Latin original, with instances of the use of old Latin commentaries, first pointed out by Dr. Georg Schepss in an article in the *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 94. A note from Prof. Sievers on the dialect of the text shows that both MSS contain Kenticisms, and that the Metra are full of them.

As to the authorship and date of the work, it is considered certain that King Alfred was the author of the prose version, but not so certain that he was the author of the Metra, and while stating that the question is not settled, the editor seems to favor the view of Leicht, in *Anglia*, VI, that King Alfred was not the author of this alliterative metrical version.

The prose text fills 150 pages, the Metra, or 'Lays,' 56, and the very convenient glossary with references, and a brief index of proper names, the remaining 122 pages.

Old English scholars will welcome this new edition of King Alfred's *Boethius*, for none has been published since that of Fox in 1864, giving the text of B without collation of the MS and "apparently copied from Rawlinson's edition" of 1698. Cardale's edition of 1829 also contained the B text.